

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.: 09/711,240

Filed: November 13, 2000

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR KIDNEY DIALYSIS

Art Unit: 1723

Examiner: J. Drodge

Docket No.: ALT-56040 CON II of DIV III

Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

DIALYSIS

COPY OF PAPERS EN 1 9 2002

TE 1700

## **RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Sir:

Please enter the following Response in the above-identified patent application.

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, Claims 30-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,370,983 ("Lichtenstein") in view of U.S. Patent No., 4,898,578 ("Rubalcaba") and/or U.S. Patent No. 4,756,706 ("Kerns"). The Patent Office primarily relies on Lichtenstein and therefore relies on the other cited references, alone or in combination, to remedy the deficiencies of Lichtenstein.

Applicants respectfully submit that the obviousness rejection of the pending claims is improper. Of the pending claims, Claims 30-34, 37, 40 and 41 are the sole independent claims. Each of the independent claims relates to a hemodialysis apparatus. The hemodialysis apparatus of the claimed invention includes, in part, a touch screen adapted to display an indicium which corresponds to a parameter pertinent to the operation of the hemodialysis apparatus and to permit a user, by touching the indicium, to cause a change in the parameter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Patent Office had failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the pending claims of the present application. Of course, "the Examiner must show some reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed." *In re Rouffet*, 47 U.S.P.O. 2d 1453, 1457-1458 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Indeed, this requirement for some